UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/883,634	06/18/2001	Jeff Williams	120222.00001	2497

7590 12/10/2002

Robert C. Klinger
Jackson Walker L.L.P.
Suite 600
2435 North Central Expressway
Richardson, TX 75080

EXAMINER	
DRODGE, JOSEPH W	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1723	4

DATE MAILED: 12/10/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

mk-4

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/883,634	WILLIAMS
Examiner	**Art Unit**
JOSEPH DRODGE	1723

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *Nov 14, 2002* .

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL.** 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above, claim(s) *1-15* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *16-20* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☒ Claims *1-15* are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:

1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

1. Applicant's election without traverse of claims 16-20 in Paper No. 3 is acknowledged.

Specification

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is not specifically drawn and limited to the subject matter of the elected claims. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

3. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the elected claims are directed.

4. The following title is suggested: "Pumping system for supplying a mop with cleaning solution and fresh water".

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

5. Claims 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 16, scope of preamble terminology "cleaning compound/fresh water system" is unclear as well as misleading; systems for supplying fresh water encompass diverse water purification systems and are not generally not related to systems for cleaning anything , particularly with a selected compound. It is suggested that the preamble be changed to "...supplying a mop with cleaning solution and fresh water".

In claim 17, no nexus is seen between structure of a timer feature and recited functions of turning the pump on and off, and controlling duration of pump operation and controlling pumping direction; in particular, the function of reversing pump direction would require a component separate from a timer; it is noted that no structural feature for changing pumping direction is claimed.

In claim 18, antecedent basis is lacking for "the liquid", it is unclear which liquid is referenced.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
>
> (e) the invention was described in-
> (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or
> (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

7. Claims 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yamamoto patent 6,279,587.

Yamamoto discloses a cleaning system comprising pump 38, intake line 36, outlet line 46, timer 90 and processor 44 coupled to pump by cord 82 as described in column 3, line 62-column 4, line 28 [as in claims 17 and 20], means to add solution to liquid (tank 20 and means discussed in column 3, lines 47-61) coupled to the pump by tubing 31, 30 and 36 [as in claim 18], and filter/strainer 32 coupled to the pump via tubes 31 and 30 [as in claim 19].

8. Claims 16 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nichols patent 3,630,369.

Nichols discloses a mop cleaning system comprising pump 42, intake 46, outlet 49, the intake coupled to a filter 48 [as in claim 19].

9. Claims 16 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Caruso patent 3,630,369.

Caruso discloses pump 38 with intake 92 and outlet 40 (column 9, lines 53-56) and also a pump control processor 58/column 6, lines 49-51 [as required in claim 20].

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

12. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nichols in view of Kweon patent 5,424,939 and Yamamoto patent 6,279,587.

Claim 17 differs from Nichols in requiring a timer to control pump operation. Such timer is suggested by Kweon in a mop cleaning station in column 2, lines 30-47 and column 5, lines 24-47 in combination with Yamamoto column 3, line 62-column 4, line 28, At the time the present invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art to have modified the Nichols system by adding such timer, as taught by Kweon and Yamamoto, in order to control amount of water and solution added so as to correlate with amount of soiling to be removed.

13. Claim 18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nichols in view of Kweon combined with Yamamoto as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Caruso.

Claim 18 further differs from Nichols in requiring means to add cleaning solution to a liquid. However, Caruso teaches such means in column 10, lines 40-43. At the time the present invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art to have added the cleaning solution adding means to the Nichols system, as suggested by Caruso, in order to establish optimum cleaning capacity of the mop by using the proper amount of water and cleaning solution.

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Biggs patent 6,279,195 is of interest as a mop cleaning system having a more elaborate filtering mechanism.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph W. Drodge whose telephone number is (703) 308-0403. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from approximately 8:30 AM - 4:45 PM.

The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9310 or (703) 872-9311 for after final submissions. When filing a FAX in Tech Center 1700, please indicate in the Header (upper right) "Official" for papers that are to be entered into the file, and "Unofficial" for draft documents and other communication with the PTO that are not for entry into the file of the application. This will expedite processing of your papers.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

Joseph W. Drodge
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1723

JWD
December 6, 2002